

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 9-13 remain in the application. Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, and 9 have been amended and claims 8 and 14 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

The specification has been amended to change "AV/V" on page 15, line 4 to --AV/C--and to change "the first second apparatus" on page 34, line 8 to --the second apparatus--, as required in the Office Action at paragraph 2.

Further, the specification has been amended to make reference to the video sub-units 31, 41, and 51 shown in Fig. 1, as required in the Office Action at paragraph 5.

Furthermore, attached as Exhibit A is a replacement sheet for Fig. 1 including previously omitted element 2, as required in the Office Action at paragraph 4.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 3 and 14 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claim 14 has been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection thereof moot.

Claim 3 has been amended to change the recitation "the resetting" to --a resetting--, as requested in the Office

Action at paragraph 7.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 3 is clear and definite in its recitation of the present invention and meets all requirements of 35 USC 112.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 6, 7, and 9 under 35 USC 102(a), as being anticipated by Iijima et al. '983.

Features of the networked apparatuses according to the present invention are that settings of an output status in a first apparatus are preset by a transmission of a predetermined command from a second apparatus so that audio/video stream data output from the first apparatus is received by the second apparatus. Independent claims 6 and 9 have been amended to recite these features of the present invention.

Looking at Iijima et al. '983 we see that there is no command control of audio/video stream data output from a network apparatus. Iijima et al. '983 is merely managing read/write operations to a storage element (MIC) built in a recording medium.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended

independent claims 6 and 9, and the claims depending therefrom are not anticipated by Iijima et al. '983.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-4, 8, and 14 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Iijima et al. '983 in view of the so-called admitted prior art.

Claims 8 and 14 have been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection thereof moot.

Features of the networked apparatuses controlling method according to the present invention are that in an audio/video stream data transmission between a first apparatus and a second apparatus, presetting of settings for inputting or outputting of the audio/video stream data in the first apparatus is directed by a transmission of a command in a predetermined format via a bus line. Claim 1 has been amended to recite these features of the present invention.

It is respectfully submitted that Iijima et al. '983 fails to show or suggest a command control of an input/output of audio/video stream data to/from a networked apparatus.

Iijima et al. '983 is merely managing read/write operations to a storage element (MIC) built in a recording

medium and, because there are no features in the so-called admitted prior art that somehow could be combined with Iijima et al. '983 and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 1, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over Iijima et al. '983 in view of the so-called admitted prior art.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 5 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Iijima et al. '983 in view of the so-called admitted prior art and further in view of Iijima et al. '244.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1 which rejection over Iijima et al. '983 in view of the so-called admitted prior art has been addressed above and, because there are no features in Iijima et al. '244 that somehow could be combined with Iijima et al. '983 and the so-called admitted prior art and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5 is patentably distinct over Iijima et al. '983 in view of the so-called admitted prior art and further in view of Iijima et al. '244.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the

rejection of claims 10-12 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Iijima et al. '983.

Claims 10-12 depend from claim 1 which rejection over Iijima et al. '983 has been addressed above and, for at least the same reasons, claims 10-12 are submitted to be patentably distinct over Iijima et al. '983.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 13 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Iijima et al. '983 in view of Iijima et al. '244.

Claim 13 depends from claim 9 which rejection over Iijima et al. '983 has been addressed above and, because there are no features in Iijima et al. '244 that somehow could be combined with Iijima et al. '983 and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 is patentably distinct over Iijima et al. '983 in view of Iijima et al. '244.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and is not seen to show or suggest the present invention as recited in the amended claims.

7217/60192

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Cooper & Dunham LLP


Jay A. Maioli
Reg. No. 27,213

JHM/PCF:tb